

LBNL-40316

UC-000

**THE MONITORING, EVALUATION, REPORTING, AND VERIFICATION
OF CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION PROJECTS:
DISCUSSION OF ISSUES AND METHODOLOGIES AND
REVIEW OF EXISTING PROTOCOLS AND GUIDELINES**

Edward Vine and Jayant Sathaye

**Energy Analysis Program
Environmental Energy Technologies Division
Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
Berkeley, CA 94720**

December 1997

**Prepared for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Climate Policy and Program Division
Office of Economics and Environment
Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation**

Maurice LeFranc, Project Manager

**This work was supported by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency through the U.S. Department
of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098.**

ABSTRACT

Because of concerns with the growing threat of global climate change from increasing emissions of greenhouse gases, the United States and other countries are implementing, by themselves or in cooperation with one or more other nations (i.e., joint implementation), climate change mitigation projects. These projects will reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions or sequester carbon, and will also result in non-GHG impacts (i.e., environmental, economic, and social impacts).

Monitoring, evaluating, reporting, and verifying (MERV) guidelines are needed for these projects in order to accurately determine their net GHG, and other, benefits. Implementation of MERV guidelines is also intended to: (1) increase the reliability of data for estimating GHG benefits; (2) provide real-time data so that mid-course corrections can be made; (3) introduce consistency and transparency across project types and reporters; and (4) enhance the credibility of the projects with stakeholders.

Any proposed MERV guidelines should reflect the following principles: they should be consistent, technically sound, readily verifiable, objective, simple, relevant, transparent, and cost-effective. In practice, tradeoffs will have to be made among some of these criteria: e.g., simplicity versus the technical soundness of a guideline, and high transaction costs and comprehensiveness.

In this paper, we review the issues and methodologies involved in MERV activities. In addition, we review protocols and guidelines that have been developed for MERV of GHG emissions in the energy and non-energy sectors by governments, nongovernmental organizations, and international agencies. We comment on their relevance and completeness, and identify several topics that future protocols and guidelines need to address, such as: (1) establishing a credible baseline; (2) accounting for impacts outside project boundaries through leakage; (3) net GHG reductions and other impacts; (4) precision of measurement; (5) MERV frequency; (6) persistence (sustainability) of savings, emissions reduction, and carbon sequestration; (7) reporting by multiple project participants; (8) verification of GHG reduction credits; (9) uncertainty and risk; (10) institutional capacity in conducting MERV; and (11) the cost of MERV.

Some of the MERV issues are of a generic nature, whose resolution would benefit all future MERV guidelines and protocols. These issues would best be addressed through an international consensus. The consensus should:

1. Clarify, at the earliest possible date, the accepted roles and responsibilities of national governments, private businesses, nongovernment organizations, and international organizations in the joint implementation accreditation process. Clearer property

rights would reduce MERV costs, by focusing these activities on the correct parties at an earlier point in time.

2. Initiate a process to certify nongovernment organizations to provide MERV services.
3. Provide guidance on the determination of a baseline. How long should a baseline remain “fixed” before a new baseline is developed? If new information becomes available after a project has been implemented, does the baseline have to remain fixed after implementation and as specified in a certification document, or can the baseline be adjusted?
4. Decide whether MERV guidelines could exclude certain types of projects that are most likely small in scale. Also, one could specify thresholds for an accumulation of projects in the economy above which significant indirect impacts are to be expected (e.g., if 5-10% of electricity generated in a country is affected by a project).
5. Decide when a country’s laws and guidelines (e.g., environmental impact statements) apply; e.g., where an investor country funds a project in a host country, do the laws of the investor country apply? or the host country’s? or both? And what happens if the laws from the two countries conflict?
6. Create a tribunal to resolve disputes over verification results and develop a set of MERV guidelines.

The COP and national governments should foster information exchange for joint implementation in general, and for MERV issues discussed in this report.

In conclusion, there is a need to collect, analyze, summarize and disseminate the best responses to the topics addressed in this report and currently being dealt with in existing climate change mitigation projects. The experience gained in these projects should be very helpful for formulating MERV guidelines for climate change mitigation projects, which is the next phase in our project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	vii
Acknowledgments	viii
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Objectives of the Paper	2
1.2.1. Monitoring domain	4
1.2.2. Carbon credits and trading.....	6
1.3. Organization of the Paper	7
Chapter 2. Existing Protocols and Guidelines	8
2.1. GHG-Related Protocols and Guidelines	8
2.1.1. USIIJ's project proposal guidelines.....	9
2.1.2. SBSTA's Uniform Reporting Format guidelines.....	10
2.1.3. WBCSD's project proposal guidelines.....	11
2.1.4. World Bank's monitoring and evaluation guidelines.....	11
2.1.5. DOE's voluntary reporting of greenhouse gases.....	12
2.1.6. Winrock's carbon monitoring guidelines	13
2.1.7. SGS Forestry's Carbon Offset Verification Service.....	14
2.2. Non-GHG-Related Protocols and Guidelines.....	16
2.2.1. DOE's energy measurement and verification protocol.....	16
2.2.2. EPA's acid rain monitoring protocols	18
2.2.3. EPA's Conservation Verification Protocols.....	19
2.2.4. Dutch reporting and monitoring guidelines for long term agreements	20
2.3. Summary.....	21
Chapter 3. Generic MERV Issues.....	24
3.1. MERV Principles	24
3.2. MERV Impacts and Responsibilities	24
3.2.1. GHG emissions impacts.....	26
3.2.2. Other environmental impacts.....	28
3.2.3. Economic and social impacts.....	30

3.3. Establishing a Credible Baseline	31
3.3.1. Monitoring domain revisited	33
3.3.2. Net GHG and other impacts.....	34
3.4. Precision of Measurement.....	37
3.5. MERV Frequency	39
3.6. Persistence (Sustainability) of Impacts.....	41
3.7. Multiple Reporting.....	43
3.8. Verification of GHG Reduction Credits	43
3.9. Uncertainty and Risk	45
3.10. Institutional Issues	47
3.10.1. Roles and responsibilities	49
3.10.2. Qualifications of MERV personnel and organizations	51
3.10.3. Staffing, training, instrumentation and lab facilities	52
3.11. Cost of MERV.....	52
3.12. Summary.....	53
 Chapter 4. MERV Issues and Methodologies for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Projects	 55
4.1. Project Types	55
4.2. MERV Issues.....	57
4.3. Data Collection and Analysis Methods	58
4.3.1. Engineering methods	59
4.3.2. Basic statistical models for evaluation.....	61
4.3.3. Multivariate statistical models for evaluation	62
4.3.4. End-use metering	62
4.3.5. Short-term monitoring.....	63
4.3.6. Integrative methods	63
4.4. Net Energy Impacts and Comparison Groups	64
4.5. Calculating GHG Impacts	64
4.6. Summary.....	65
 Chapter 5. MERV Issues and Methodologies for Forestry Projects.....	 68
5.1. Introduction.....	68
5.2. Types of Projects	68
5.2.1. Biomass energy plantations.....	70
5.2.2. Unique features of forestry projects	71
5.3. MERV Issues.....	72

5.3.1. Monitoring domain	72
5.3.2. Socioeconomic impacts	74
5.4. Measurement Perspectives	74
5.5. Data Collection and Analysis Methods	75
5.6. Inventory Analysis of Carbon Pools	77
5.6.1. Above-ground woody biomass	78
5.6.2. Below-ground woody biomass	78
5.6.3. Calculating carbon storage in woody biomass	78
5.6.4. Carbon storage in annual plants	79
5.6.5. Soil carbon	79
5.6.6. Forest products	79
5.7. Net Carbon Impacts and Comparison Plots	80
5.7.1. Sampling	81
5.8. Summary	82
Chapter 6. Summary and Conclusions	84
6.1. Existing GHG and Non-GHG Protocols and Guidelines	84
6.2. Guiding Principles	88
6.3. Resolution of Generic MERV Issues	89
6.4. Concluding Thoughts	90
References	92
Appendices	
A. USIJ's Project Proposal Guidelines	A-1
B. SBSTA's Uniform Reporting Format	B-1
C. Uniform Reporting Formats Completed by Other Countries	C-1
D. WBCD's Guidelines for Completing Proposals	D-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Key Features of Existing GHG Protocols and Guidelines	22
Table 2. Key Features of Existing Non-GHG Protocols and Guidelines	23
Table 3. MERV Principles.....	25
Table 4. Monitoring of Forest Mitigation Projects.....	40
Table 5. Primary MERV Responsibilities	49
Table 6. Generic MERV Issues and Potential Response Options	54
Table 7. Examples of End-Use Efficiency Measures.....	56
Table 8. Advantages and Disadvantages of Data Collection and Analysis Methods	67
Table 9. Forestry Projects and Parameters for Calculation of Net Carbon Storage.....	70
Table 10. Advantages and Disadvantages of Forestry Monitoring Methods	83
Table 11. Topics Addressed by Existing GHG Protocols and Guidelines.....	86

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Maurice N. LeFranc, Jr. and Jackie Krieger of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Climate Policy and Program Division, Office of Economics and Environment, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation for their assistance and comments on previous drafts of this paper. We would also like to express our appreciation for the following people who reviewed an earlier draft of this report: Ken Andrasko, Noreen Beg, Katherine Begg, Neil Bird, Alison Bos, Sam Fankhauser, Johannes Heister, Steve Meyers, Axel Michaelowa, Irving Mintzer, Pedro Moura Costa, Emilio Libre La Rovere, Mark Trexler, and Steve Wiel. This work was supported by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency through the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098.